

Claims 1-16 are all the claims pending in this application. Claim 1 is the only independent claim. Claims 1-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Toy (U.S. Patent No. 6,192,115), in view of Okoro (U.S. Patent No. 6,754,490).

Claims 9-10 and 13-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Toy, in view of Okoro, and further in view of Dunn (U.S. Patent No. 6,138,008). In addition, claims 11-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Toy, in view of Okoro, in view of Asano (U.S. Patent No. 5,991,721). As set out more fully below, Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Claims 1-16

Independent claim 1 recites, among other things, an information storing unit which stores information about a mobile station including whether or not the mobile station has moved to a second country and has registered as a visitor station in the second country. In addition, claim 1 recites a notification unit which detects whether a called mobile station is registered as a visitor station in a second country, and notifies the caller terminal of the registration status before making a connection between the caller terminal and the mobile station.

The Examiner asserts that Toy discloses all of these elements with the exception of the “international roaming aspect.” The Examiner then asserts that the international roaming aspect is disclosed by Okoro. Further, he Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the international roaming services between countries (supplied by Okoro) to provide continuous communication between boarding countries. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Initially, Applicant notes that claim 1 does not recite the term “international roaming aspect.” Instead, the preamble of claim 1 recites “[A] notification system for notifying information about a mobile station capable of using international roaming service, comprising.” Accordingly, it is by no means clear which elements from claim 1 the Examiner asserts are missing from Toy or, on the other hand, supplied by Okoro. In any event, Applicant submits that Toy fails to disclose, teach or suggest the recited information storing unit and notification unit of claim 1.

Toy appears to address determining whether a mobile phone is located in a certain geographical location in order to determine the cost of making a call to that mobile telephone. However, Toy fails to disclose, teach or suggest a storing information unit which stores the registration status of a mobile station, as recited in claim 1. In fact, the information supplied by Toy is limited to certain “basic location information” and “extended information.” (Col. 4, lines 48-50). However, neither type of information addresses the registration status of the called party’s mobile station. In particular, Toy is completely silent regarding the registration of a mobile station as a visitor. In addition, Toy does not disclose the contents of the “basic information” or the “extended information.” Accordingly, Toy’s databases are different from the information storing unit of the present invention.

Given the above, Toy does not disclose, teach or suggest an information storing unit which stores the registration information of a mobile station. Simply put, Toy fails to disclose, teach or suggest a notification unit which detects whether a called mobile station is registered as a visitor station in a second country. Since Toy fails to address the registration status of a called

party's mobile station, it does not disclose, teach or suggest the recited information storing unit and/or the notification unit of independent claim 1.

Okoro does not disclose, teach or suggest the elements missing from Toy, as set out above. The Examiner only asserts that Okoro discloses certain international roaming services. Initially, Applicant submits that such "international roaming services" are not the same as, or similar to, the recited information storing unit and notification unit missing from Toy. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully suggests that the Examiner's asserted combination of Toy and Okoro is improper. As such, independent claim 1 remains patentable.

The remaining § 103(a) rejections of claims 2-16 rely on the combination of Toy and Okoro with other references. As noted above, the asserted combination of Toy and Okoro does not disclose all the elements recited in independent claim 1. Since the additional references cited by the Examiner fail to supply the elements missing from Toy, and the Examiner has not argued otherwise, dependent claims 2-16 remain patentable.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Appln. No. 10/614,056

Q76455

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Eric P. Halber
Registration No. 46,378

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: July 28, 2005